

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to original Fig. 2. This sheet which includes Figs. 1, 2A, 2B, and 3, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 1-3. More specifically, Fig. 2 has been replaced by Figs. 2A and 2B.

Please approve the drawing changes that are marked in red on the accompanying "Annotated Sheet Showing Changes." A formal "Replacement Sheet" is also enclosed.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-18 remain in the application. Claims 1-18 have been amended.

In item 1 on pages 2-3 of the above-identified Office action, the drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the "roller receiving part which is adjustable relative to the second base plate" must be shown or the feature(s) cancelled from the claim(s).

Fig. 2 has been replaced with Figs. 2A and 2B to clearly show that the roller receiving part 20 is adjustable relative to the second base plate 10 (see page 6, lines 12-14 of the specification). The specification has been amended accordingly.

In item 3 on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, claims 5-9 and 17-18 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the term "adjustable" is not clear in the context of the claims in what way and by what structure is the device adjustable.

This rejection is not understood. The term "adjustable" is clear in the context because the claims are not required to recite in what way and by what structure the roller receiving part (20) is adjustable relative to the second base plate (10) and the roller (40) is adjustable relative to the first base plate (30) so long it is supported by the specification. The term "adjustable" is especially clear from Figs. 2A and 2B. Nevertheless, the term "adjustable" has been changed to "displaceable" in order to facilitate the prosecution.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic and/or clarificatory reasons. The changes are neither provided for overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claims for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In item 5 on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1, 5, 7, 10-13, and 16-18 have been rejected as being anticipated by Tidbury et al. (US 5,937,585) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In item 7 on pages 4-5 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 2-4 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Tidbury et al. in view of Ingham (US 3,358,318) and Fleischauer et al. (US 4,198,833) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In item 8 on page 5 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 6 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Tidbury et al. in view of Pence (US 3,888,445) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In item 9 on pages 5-6 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 9 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Tidbury et al. in view of Nakanishi (US 4,086,681) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In item 10 on page 6 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 14-15 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Tidbury et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In item 11 on pages 6-7 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 8 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Tidbury et al. in view of Angle (US 4,544,192) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

The rejections have been noted and claims 1 and 11 have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found in paragraph [0005] and [0022] of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

a bumper element associated with said second member, said bumper element being mounted in said guide recess and being configured to at least partly enclose the roller when said first member and said second member are engaged.

Claim 11 calls for, inter alia:

a bumper element associated with said second member, said bumper element being mounted in said guide recess and being configured to at least partly enclose said roller when the vehicle door is in a closed state.

The amendment to claims 1 and 11 of the instant application makes it clear that the bumper element (24) is a separate part, which is mounted in the guide recess (28) and is

positioned that it at least partly encloses the roller when the door is closed.

Tidbury et al. relate to an anti-rattle door assembly (see Fig. 2), wherein the second member 26 is formed with a tapering recess 76 having lower and upper convergent surfaces 78, 80 which terminate at a parallel sided slot 82 having lower and upper surfaces 84, 86. The lower surface 78 is upwardly inclined to form a ramp for cooperation with the roller 38, which acts as an alignment guide during door closing. The top of the roller will remain clear of the surface 86 as it rolls into the slot 82 and will not prevent vertical displacement between the first and the second members 22, 26. It is explained with reference to Figs. 4 and 5 that the roller 38 enters the slot 82 and the lower surface 46 of the first wedge-shaped member 41 is against the ramp surface 78. As shown in Fig. 5, the roller 38 rests at the parallel sided slot 82.

Therefore, Tidbury et al. teach separating of the functions of guiding the door with a roller and stopping the closing movement with a complex mechanism including wedge-shaped elements. In contrast, the invention of the instant application uses the roller for guiding and stopping the

closing movement, thus providing a simpler arrangement of an anti-rattle door assembly.

Clearly, Tidbury et al. do not show "said bumper element being mounted in said guide recess and being configured to at least partly enclose said roller," as recited in claims 1 and 11 of the instant application.

Claims 1 and 11 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over Tidbury et al. and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 11, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-18 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of three months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$510 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Applic. No.: 10/689,671
Amdt. Dated June 20, 2005
Reply to Office action of December 20, 2004

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of
Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Yonghong Chen
For Applicants

Yonghong Chen
Reg. No. 56,150

YC

June 20, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

